

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

Blair M. Lord
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

217-581-2121
blord@eiu.edu

To: Mary Anne Hanner, Dean, College of Sciences

Date: April 28, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences

Consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement (Agreement)*, the attached revised statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is approved. This approval is consistent with your recommendation and is effective for evaluation periods commencing January, 2008. As always, any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the *Agreement* or its successor agreement(s).

I note that the department continues to make the inclusion of responses to open-ended items on student evaluations permissive. Making the inclusion of student responses to open-ended items permissive, appears contrary to the spirit of the principle of wholeness as applied to student evaluations, and I encourage the department to give further consideration to this practice. Evaluators may ask for more information during their respective reviews including, but not limited to, student responses to open-ended items.

The DAC includes a statement about the award of special CUs that is outside the scope of a description of the materials and methods of evaluation. Faculty Assignment of Duties Guidelines – Effective Fall 2008 issued earlier this semester supercedes such statements in the DAC.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC review and revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences in discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. The department is urged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachment: Revised DAC; Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences

cc: Chair, Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences (with attachment)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION DISORDERS AND SCIENCES
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Departmental Application of Criteria
Effective Date: January 1, 2008

Preamble

University and department policy state that performance of Teaching/Primary Duties is the most important function of a faculty member at Eastern Illinois University. In the CDS Department, Research/Creative Activity shall receive greater emphasis than service. However, the CDS department provides a significant public service to Eastern Illinois University, the community of Charleston, and the surrounding east central Illinois area by its operation of the Speech-Language-Hearing Clinic. Faculty have many responsibilities associated with the delivery of service to patients through the Clinic and the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the community and the university.

I. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance Area

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Level 1: Satisfactory performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities from the following:

- a. Satisfactory classroom teaching (e.g. tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials).
- b. Satisfactory clinical teaching (e.g. tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials, meeting ASHA's minimum observation requirements).
- c. Satisfactory academic advisement (e.g., student evaluations, advisement materials).
- d. Teaching as an invited guest lecturer in the department.
- e. Completion of 10 or more hours of continuing education.

Level 2: Highly effective performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities from the following:

- a. Highly effective classroom teaching (e.g., tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials).
- b. Highly effective clinical teaching (e.g. tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials, exceeding ASHA's minimum observation requirements).
- c. Highly effective use of technology and innovative teaching techniques which enhance the learning process.
- d. Highly effective academic advisement (e.g. student evaluations, advisement materials).
- e. Teaching as an invited guest lecturer outside the department.
- f. Curriculum revision, curriculum development, or development of teaching assignments.
- g. Participation as a faculty committee member mentoring student projects associated with undergraduate honors program or graduate thesis.
- h. Mentoring an independent study.
- i. Completion of course(s)/training related to primary duties.
- j. Completion of 20 or more hours of continuing education.

Level 3: Superior performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities from the following:

- a. Superior classroom teaching (e.g. tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials).
- b. Superior clinical teaching (e.g. tenured CDS faculty member/chairperson evaluations, other peer evaluations, student evaluations, course materials).
- c. Superior use of technology and innovative teaching techniques which enhance the learning process.
- d. For Unit B faculty, evidence of leadership related to performance of primary duties.
- e. Evidence of leadership as a faculty mentor in student projects associated with undergraduate

- h. honors program or graduate thesis.
- f. Receipt of credential, award, or other recognition for teaching.
- g. Completion of 30 or more hours of continuing education.
- h. Receipt of an award for continuing education, such as the Award for Continuing Education (ACE) from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, indicating completion of at least 70 hours of continuing education within a three year period.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Level 1: Satisfactory performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Research/creative activity or presentation (non-competitive selection) in conjunction with a student project or seminar.
- b. Local level professional presentation.
- c. Research/creative activity associated with professional organizations which serve the needs of the communicatively impaired.
- d. Demonstration of works in progress (e.g. manuscripts, assessment/intervention materials clinical materials, student thesis collaboration for presentation).
- e. Receipt of an internal grant or other funding to attend research/creative activity.
- f. Documentation regarding individual line of research/creative activity.

Level 2: Significant performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Research /creative activity or presentation (competitive selection) in conjunction with a student project or seminar.
- b. State/regional level presentation (e.g. ISHA area groups, ISHA convention, other state communication disorders conference, StarNet).
- c. Receipt of an internal grant or other funding to pursue research/creative activities.
- d. Publication of article in non-peer reviewed journal.
- e. Completion of requested peer review for professional publications.
- f. Publication of abstract/commentary in peer-reviewed journal.

Level 3: Superior accomplishment may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Presentation at out-of-state/national/international professional conference.
- b. Research activity or presentation in conjunction with a student project or seminar at a national/international level.
- c. Earning a fellowship, external grant, or other funding to pursue research/creative activity.
- d. Receipt of an award or other recognition for research/creative activity.
- e. Publication in peer reviewed journal (e.g. research/clinical article, editorial).
- f. Publication of books, chapters, or assessment/intervention materials based on clinical theory or research.
- g. Appointment to editorial board of a peer reviewed professional journal.

C. Service

Level 1: Satisfactory performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Service on a departmental committee.
- b. Service to enhance the department that requires occasional, limited commitment (e.g. choosing artwork, recruitment activities).
- c. Service as a resource for professional colleagues or agencies.

Level 2: Significant performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Leadership on a departmental committee.
- b. Service to enhance the department that requires frequent commitment (e.g. computer expertise, department events).
- c. Service on a college/university committee.
- d. Service for local, regional, or state committee/organization (e.g., ECISHA, ISHA).
- e. Performance as a speech-language-hearing specialist for professional colleagues or

- professional agencies.
- f. Advisement of a student organization.

Level 3: Superior performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Leadership activities on a college or university committee.
- b. Leadership activities in local, regional, state organization/committee.
- c. Consultation as a speech-language-hearing specialist with professional colleagues or professional agencies that requires substantial or ongoing commitment.
- d. Supervision of Clinical Fellowship Year (CFY) for a professional colleague.
- e. Receipt of an award or other recognition for service-related activities.
- f. Committee membership/leadership in national/international organization/committee (e.g., ASHA).

II. Methods of Evaluation

A. Department Personnel Committee

1. **Composition:** The Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences Personnel Committee is composed of three elected voting members and one elected non-voting alternate. Each shall be selected annually from tenured faculty according to DPC bylaws. The alternate will serve as a voting member in the absence of a voting member or in personnel decisions relating to a voting member.
2. **Review Procedures:** In each of the performance areas, submitted materials will be individually reviewed by members of the DPC. Independent evaluations concerning the level of accomplishments will be compared at a meeting of the DPC. Qualitative evaluation of the submitted material will be used to judge the degree of effectiveness of an employee's performance, identify areas of strength and weakness, improve the employee's performance, and provide a basis to make recommendations and decisions concerning retention, promotion, and tenure. The DPC's evaluation should be independent of and presented to the Department Chair, the Dean of the College of Sciences, the University Personnel Committee, and the Provost.

B. Student Evaluation Procedures

1. All faculty, including nontenured tenure-track, tenured faculty completing annual evaluations, and annually contracted faculty, will submit student evaluations for all course/clinical assignments. Student course evaluations must include the approved university core of evaluation items; additional items selected by the employee may be included. All student evaluations must be included for any section of a course in which student evaluations were conducted. Inclusion of narrative comments is optional, but if narratives are included, all should be provided.
2. In evaluating distance learning courses, both technological and pedagogical aspects shall be included in student evaluations.
3. **Administration of Student Evaluations:** Faculty will order student course forms from the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing and make arrangements for a faculty member to administer the evaluations. Faculty administering the evaluations should follow the administration guidelines revised and approved by the department on 10/10/2000. The faculty member administering the evaluations delivers the objective evaluations and the written evaluations to the departmental secretary. Completed objective evaluations are forwarded to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing. The Department Chair distributes one copy of the statistical analysis of the evaluations to faculty members after grades have been posted, with the exception of early evaluation. Written student evaluations are held by the department secretary and returned to the faculty member after grades are posted.

Administration of Student Evaluations for Clinical Practicum: The Clinic Director will distribute the department approved faculty evaluation forms and instructions for completion of the forms to students. The Clinic Director arranges a confidential procedure for students to return the forms and then forwards them to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing for analysis. After finals week, the Clinic Director returns the written comments and one copy of the statistical analysis to the faculty member. One copy of the statistical analysis is forwarded to the Department Chair.

C. Chair/Tenured Faculty Evaluation Procedures

1. Non-tenured/tenure-track faculty

- a. All non-tenured, tenure-track faculty applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will submit at least one chairperson and one tenured CDS faculty member evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duties. For each area (e.g. teaching, supervision) in which 3 or more credit units (CUs) per evaluation period are assigned (e.g. classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs), one Department Chair and one tenured faculty evaluation per evaluation period will be submitted. Consultation between faculty member and evaluator shall occur prior to the observation. Tenured faculty and peer evaluators will use the university peer evaluation form. Copies of evaluations by tenured faculty and peer evaluators shall be given to the faculty member who requested the evaluation and to the Chair. Chairperson observations may be recorded via the approved university peer evaluation form. If not, Chair evaluations will result in a written summary submitted to the faculty member. The summary will minimally specify the duty observed, date, time, and length of observation.
- b. With the exception of research, service, and sabbatical assignments, activities for which 3 or more CUs per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. For assigned duties other than research, service, or sabbaticals, the employee will be evaluated as appropriate by the Chair.
- c. In evaluating distance learning courses, both technological and pedagogical aspects shall be included in CDS faculty member/Chair evaluations.

2. Tenured Faculty

- a. Faculty applying for professional advancement increase (PAI) or promotion (multi-year evaluation) will be evaluated by having a minimum of one Chair and one tenured CDS faculty member evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duties. For each area (e.g. teaching, supervision) in which 3 or more credit units (CUs) per evaluation period are assigned (e.g. classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs), one Department Chair and one tenured faculty evaluation per evaluation period will be submitted. The evaluation period is since the submission of the portfolio for the last promotion or PAI, or five years, whichever is shorter.
- b. Tenured faculty not being considered for promotion need to include required student course evaluations and documented activities in the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity and service.
- c. In evaluating distance learning courses, both technological and pedagogical aspects shall be included in CDS faculty member/Chair evaluations.

3. Annually Contracted Faculty

- a. All annually contracted faculty will provide at least one evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duty by the Department Chair. Evaluations must be obtained for each area (e.g. classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs) for which 3 or more CUs are assigned per evaluation period.
- b. Annually contracted teaching faculty will be evaluated for teaching performance of primary duties by the same criteria as tenured/tenure track faculty members.
- c. In evaluating distance learning courses, both technological and pedagogical aspects shall be included in CDS faculty member/Chair evaluations.

D. Other Evaluation Procedures

1. The items listed under each performance level in each area of evaluation (teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activities, service) are to be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.
2. Materials and activities listed in each performance level are not rank ordered by importance.
3. Items other than those listed that are illustrative of performance may be included.
4. Items shall be included in only one section of the portfolio (teaching/performance of primary duties; research/creative activities; service).
5. Relative importance
 - a. In the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, classroom teaching evaluations and clinical teaching evaluations shall be considered of greater weight than other items in each level. Department Chair, tenured CDS faculty member, and peer evaluations shall be given

more weight than student evaluations.

- b. Research/creative activity shall receive greater emphasis than service. However, it should be recognized that the department has a unique service component.
6. For purpose of evaluation, a peer is defined as a tenured/tenure-track faculty member (e.g. CDS peer, peer with knowledge of the discipline at EIU or another university). Chair shall approve choice of peer outside the Department or university.
7. The evaluation period is defined by the collective bargaining agreement and set forth in the Schedule for Personnel Actions and Credit Unit Guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The evaluation period is not the same as an academic term. It varies depending upon appointment and rank.
8. It should be recognized that teaching evaluations might be affected by the rigor of a course or technological issues in distance learning courses. In applying these guidelines, evaluators should, therefore, recognize that new course preparation, teaching methods/traits and technological difficulties may affect evaluations.
9. Course materials (e.g. syllabi, exams) may be requested by the evaluator completing the observation.
10. Union duties, responsibilities, and projects may be considered in any of the three areas of evaluation, as appropriate.
11. Special CUs may be awarded for the following duties: honors coordinator, educational internship coordinator, medical internship coordinator, graduate program coordinator, Clinic Director.
12. Qualitative evaluation of submitted materials will be rendered by the evaluators of the DPC.
13. Informal teaching assessments may be requested by faculty members and not included in the portfolio.